

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03737 121709Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EUR-12 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /089 W

----- 035621

R 121230Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2705

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 3737

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS: JULY 10 SPC MEETING

REF: (A) USNATO 3580 DTG 031745Z JUL 75; (B) USNATO 3456 DTG

271045Z JUN 75; (C) MBFR VIENNA 276

BEGIN SUMMARY: THE QUESTION OF PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS
WAS ON SPC AGENDA JULY 10 IN VIEW OF FRG AND BELGIAN DESIRE TO
WORK NOW ON ALLIED POSITION FOR USE WITH EAST AT LATER, APPROPRIATE
TIME. FRG REP REITERATED FRG OPPOSITION TO INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION
COMMITMENTS, AND FRG WILLINGNESS TO NOTIFY EAST OF ALLOCATION
OF ALLIED REDUCTIONS AFTER THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS
(LEAVING VAGUE WHETHER THAT WOULD BE BEFORE OR AFTER SIGNATURE).
BELGIAN REP AGREED WITH FRG REP THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT ACCEPT
EASTERN DISTINCTION BETWEEN REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS AND CEILINGS,
BUT STATED BELGIAN VIEW THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOTIFY EAST OF ALLOCATION
OF REDUCTIONS AFTER THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS, BUT BEFORE

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03737 121709Z

SIGNATURE. END SUMMARY.

1. SPC ON JULY 10 RETURNED TO PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS.

2. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID HE WISHED TO REPEAT THAT FRG FAVORS STUDYING THE SUBSTANCE OF THIS ISSUE, AND DECIDING WHAT THE ALLIED POSITION SHOULD BE. HE SAID PRELIMINARY FRG VIEW IS NOT TO SHARE THE IDEA THAT A CLEAR DISTINCTION IS POSSIBLE BETWEEN REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS, AND CEILINGS RESULTING FROM THOSE REDUCTIONS, IN SUCH A WAY THAT ONE COULD HAVE INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS WHILE MAINTAINING THE COLLECTIVE CHARACTER OF THE COMMON CEILING. FRG RECOGNIZES THAT LOGICALLY AND LEGALLY SUCH A DISTINCTION IS POSSIBLE, BUT POLITICALLY IT IS NEXT TO IMPOSSIBLE. ONCE INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS ARE ESTABLISHED, IT WOULD BE PRACTICALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO AVOID INDIVIDUAL CEILINGS.

3. FRG REP SAID FRG HAS SERIOUS DOUBTS ABOUT SAYING TO THE EAST THAT ALLIES WOULD AGREE TO INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS IF THE EAST AGREED TO A COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING. THIS WOULD NOT WORK, AND THE RESULT WOULD BE A COMMON CEILING WITH NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS. THUS, PRELIMINARY FRG THINKING IS THAT THE ALLIES MUST STICK WITH COLLECTIVE REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. FRG DOES NOT EXCLUDE INFORMING THE OTHER SIDE ABOUT ALLOCATION OF ALLIED REDUCTIONS, BUT THIS SHOULD TAKE PLACE AFTER THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS.

4. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) SAID HE COULD UNDERSTAND THE LOGIC OF THE EASTERN DISTINCTION BETWEEN REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS AND CEILINGS. HOWEVER, IT WOULD BE BAD TACTICALLY TO ACCEPT THIS DISTINCTION, ESPECIALLY NOW. THUS, BELGIUM EXCLUDES THIS COURSE. ALLIES SHOULD NOT LET THE EAST CARRY THEM ALONG RE THIS DISTINCTION WITHOUT THE CERTAINTY THAT THE EAST WILL ACCEPT A COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING. HOWEVER, THE OTHER SIDE NEEDS TO KNOW HOW THE ALLIES WILL ALLOCATE THEIR REDUCTIONS WITHIN THE COMMON CEILING.

5. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT HIS COUNTRY THEREFORE FAVORS NOTIFYING TO THE OTHER SIDE THE ALLOCATION OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS DECIDED AMONG THE ALLIES. HE SAID BELGIUM AGREED WITH FRG THAT THIS NOTIFICATION SHOULD TAKE PLACE AFTER THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. HOWEVER, THIS NOTIFICATION SHOULD ALSO BE PRIOR TO PHASE II SIGNATURE. THIS WOULD GIVE THE OTHER SIDE SOME RE COURSE IF IT FOUND THE ALLOCATION OF ALLIED REDUCTIONS TO BE UNREASONABLE.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03737 121709Z

BELGIUM THEREFORE SUPPORTS THE AHG'S ALTERNATIVE 16-B AS THE EVENTUAL ALLIED POSITION ON THIS MATTER.

6. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) NOTED THAT FRG REP HAD SAID AT THE JULY 3RD MEETING THAT WHEN THERE IS MORE CERTAINTY ABOUT THE COMMON CEILING, FRG COULD ACCEPT A SHORTER TIME BETWEEN PHASES. HE ASKED, ON A PERSONAL BASIS, IF MORE CERTAINTY ABOUT THE COMMON CEILING WOULD ALSO PERMIT MORE PRECISION ABOUT THE ALL-PARTICIPANTS COMMITMENT, AND THE BRINGING FORWARD IN TIME OF THE ALLOCATION OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS.

7. FRG REP REPLIED THAT HE PERSONALLY THOUGHT THAT WAS CORRECT, I.E., THAT ASSURANCE BY THE OTHER SIDE REGARDING THE COLLECTIVE

COMMON CEILING COULD PERMIT MORE FLEXIBILITY ON WHEN TO INFORM THE OTHER SIDE ON THE ALLOCATION OF REDUCTIONS. NETHERLANDS REP TOLD US AFTER THE MEETING THAT HE THOUGHT FRG REP'S INITIAL RESPONSE OUT OF PHASE WITH BONN'S VIEW, BUT HE HOPES BONN WILL THINK ABOUT IT.

8. FRG REP ALSO NOTED THAT ALTERNATIVE 16-B IN THE AHG REPORT PROVIDED THAT NOTIFICATION ON ALLOCATION OF REDUCTIONS WOULD TAKE PLACE PRIOR TO SIGNATURE OF PHASE II AGREEMENT. HE POINTED OUT THAT BELGIAN REP, WHO SUPPORTS ALTERNATIVE 16-B, WISHES NOTIFICATION TO TAKE PLACE AFTER THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS AND PRIOR TO SIGNATURE. HE ASKED IF THIS WAS NOT ACTUALLY A REFINEMENT OF ALTERNATIVE 16-B. BELGIAN REP AGREED THAT IT WAS.

9. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE ALLIES WERE ASKING THE RUSSIANS TO AGREE TO A LOT IN PHASE I IN ORDER THAT THERE BE A PHASE II NEGOTIATION. HE SAID THE ALLIES MIGHT NEED TO BE SOMEWHAT MORE GENEROUS THAN THE FRG WISHES. FRG REP SAID HE AGREED THE ALLIES WERE ASKING A LOT IN THE FIRST PHASE. HOWEVER, THE QUESTION OF THE COLLECTIVE CHARACTER OF THE COMMON CEILING IS VERY IMPORTANT. IT IS DECISIVE FOR THE FORCE STRUCTURE OF EUROPE.

10. THIS SUBJECT RETURNS TO SPC AGENDA JULY 17.BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03737
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzlab.tel
Line Count: 135
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 3580 DTG 031745Z JUL 75; (B) USNATO 3456 DTG 271045Z JUN 75;
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <01 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

(C) MBFR VIENNA 276

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS: JULY 10 SPC MEETING
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006